



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/775,485	02/09/2004	Ramarathnam Venkatesan	MS1-1922US	2829
22801	7590	04/30/2007		
LEE & HAYES PLLC 421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500 SPOKANE, WA 99201			EXAMINER TRAORE, FATOUMATA	
			ART UNIT 2109	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 04/30/2007	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

lhptoms@leehayes.com

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/775,485	Applicant(s) VENKATESAN ET AL.	
	Examiner Fatoumata Traore	Art Unit 2109	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Fatoumata Traore. (3) James W. Myhre.
 (2) Bea Koempel-Thomas. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 24 April 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 9, 15 and 22.

Identification of prior art discussed: Menenzes et al (Hand book of applied Cryptography ISBN 0-8493-8523-7 and Rosen Discrete mathematics and its applications secondon edition ISBN 0-07-053744-5.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiners and application discussed about the double patenting rejeitiion, claim objection and the rejection of of claims 1, 9, 15, 22 and how to overcome the 101 problems with independent claims 1, 9, 22, applicant provided clarification on claims 9 and 22. Applicant further argued on how the prior art do not teach all the limitations of claims 9, 15 and 22. Applicant indicated that she would amend the claims in order to get allowed subject matter.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


 Examiner's signature, if required